

Appl. No. 09/633,811
Amdt. dated July 22, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 18, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application before submission of this paper. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 1, 7, 13, and 16 have been amended. Claims 13 and 16 have been amended to correct minor infelicities, and not to overcome any basis of rejection. Claims 4 and 8 are cancelled. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-20 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-4 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,469,559 issued to *Clifton* in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,571,278 issued to *Negishi* and U.S. Pat. No. 6,339,423 issued to *Sampson*. The Office Action rejected Claim 5 as being unpatentable over *Clifton* in view of *Negishi* and further in view of *Sampson* and U.S. Pat. No. 6,295,605 issued to *Dockter*. The Office Action rejected Claim 6 as being unpatentable over *Clifton* in view of *Negishi* and further in view of *Sampson*, *Dockter*, and U.S. Pat. No. 6,295,605 issued to *Goertzel*. The Office Action rejected Claims 7-12 as being unpatentable over *Clifton* in view of *Goertzel* and further in view of *Negishi* and *Dockter*. The Office Action rejected Claims 13 and 20 as being unpatentable over *Sampson* in view of *Negishi* and further in view of *Clifton*. The Office Action rejected Claims 14 and 15 as being unpatentable over *Sampson* in view of *Negishi* and further in view of *Clifton*, U.S. Pat. No. 6,453,354 issued to *Jiang*, and U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,752 issued to *Gupia*. The Office Action rejected Claim 16 as being unpatentable over *Sampson* in view of *Negishi* and further in view of *Clifton* and *Goertzel*. The Office Action rejected Claim 17 as being unpatentable over *Sampson* in view of *Negishi* and further in view of *Clifton*, *Goertzel*, and U.S. Pat. No. 5,805,820 issued to *Bellovin*. The Office Action rejected Claim 18 as being unpatentable over *Sampson* in view of *Negishi* and further in view of *Clifton* and U.S. Pat. No. 6,243,815 issued to *Antur*. The Office Action rejected Claim 19 as being unpatentable over *Sampson* in view of *Negishi* and further in view of *Clifton* and U.S. Pat. No. 6,466,980 issued to *Lumelsky*. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1, as amended, includes the limitation of Claim 4, now cancelled. Specifically, amended Claim 1 recites, "comparing the owner domain identity to the domain within which the first computing machine resides." Thus, a determination is made whether the owner domain matches the domain where the first computing machine is located. The Office Action states that

Appl. No. 09/633,811
Amdt. dated July 22, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 18, 2004

the limitation of Claim 4 (now incorporated into Claim 1) is taught by *Clifton*. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Neither *Clifton* nor any of the other cited references teach, "comparing the owner domain identity to the domain within which the first computing machine resides." Instead, *Clifton* teaches a resource access security system for controlling access to resources by the use of descriptors that identify the resources. When a resource is requested, the corresponding descriptor is translated such that only the address assigned to the requested resource in the address space of the data processing system is accessed. Data tables are used to access information about the requesting user/job, and about the pages and domains where the resources are located. The resource access security system of *Clifton* does not equate to comparing the identity of an owner domain to a domain within which a computing machine resides. Thus, Claim 1 is allowable and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claim 13 contains similar limitations to Claim 1. Specifically, Claim 13 recites "to compare the owner domain identifier with an identifier of a domain from which the request originated." Claim 13 includes at least one element that is not taught nor suggested by any of the cited prior art references. As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable. Thus, Claim 13 is allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claim 7, as amended, includes the limitation of Claim 8, now cancelled. Specifically, Claim 7 recites, "passing the security token associated with the request and the security descriptor associated with the object to the owner domain for evaluation." The Office Action states that the limitation of Claim 8 (now incorporated into Claim 7) is taught by *Dockter*. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Dockter teaches determining a security level of a resource requested by a user. Security tests are performed to determine if qualification data associated with the request matches the security level of the resource. The security tests are performed according to the speed of test execution. Neither *Dockter* nor any of the other cited references teach, "passing the security token associated with the request and the security descriptor associated with the object to the owner domain for evaluation." Thus, Claim 7 is allowable for at least this reason and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.


Appl. No. 09/633,811
Amdt. dated July 22, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 18, 2004

As discussed above, independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 are allowable. Thus, dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9-12, and 14-20 are allowable for at least the same reasons that the base claims on which they rely are allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy F. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254
JF/ab

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE